Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) – Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds

Notice of FY 2005 Request for Proposals (RFP) for the National Lakes Assessment Planning Project (NLAPP)

Initial Announcement

EPA-OW-OWOW- NLAPP 2005 – 02

Catalog of Domestic Federal Assistance Number 66.436

I. Funding Opportunity Description

A. Cooperative Agreement Objectives

The National Lakes Assessment Planning Project (NLAPP) cooperative agreements will provide eligible applicants an opportunity to develop pilot projects to design a national lakes assessment. "Lakes" in this RFP shall include lakes, reservoirs and ponds but exclude the Great Lakes. These projects may include evaluations of various indicators of lake condition (e.g., physical, chemical, biological integrity, fishable and swimmable goals of the Clean Water Act (CWA)), sampling methods (e.g., field and lab protocols, remote sensing, etc.), interpretation tools (e.g., classification and reference condition, matrices, indices, models, etc.) and organization of expert conference and workshops. EPA hopes that the pilot projects will generate results that will be considered at a meeting of lake assessment practitioners and will shape the recommendations for a study that will assess the condition of lakes at multiple scales and produce results that are statistically-valid on the national scale. The cooperative agreements will be awarded under Section 104(b)(3) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) which may only be used to conduct and promote the coordination and acceleration of activities such as research, investigations, experiments, training, education, demonstrations, surveys, and studies relating to the causes, effect, extent, prevention, reduction, and elimination of water pollution. The awards will range from $100,000 to $300,000 (except for a national

conference, which is limited to $100,000). A total of approximately $1,000,000 is available for this proposal.

The goals of this project include bringing together lake assessment practitioners on the design of a future national lake monitoring and assessment project, and building the capacity of all levels of government and non-governmental organizations to develop and implement comprehensive monitoring programs for lakes, reservoirs and ponds. These are tied into Goals Two and Four (Clean and Safe Water) of the EPA Strategic Plan, which includes monitoring of surface water aquatic ecosystems in order to evaluate the overall effectiveness of actions that protect human health, support recreational activities, and provide healthy habitat for fish, plants, and wildlife. States, Territories, Indian Tribes, interstate agencies, and possessions of the U.S., including the District of Columbia, public and private universities and colleges, hospitals, laboratories, other public or private nonprofit institutions and individuals are eligible to apply. This RFP describes the proposal selection and award process for eligible applicants interested in applying for NLAPP assistance.

B. National Lakes Assessment Planning Project (NLAPP) Funding Assistance Topic Areas

Several reports published since 2000 have pointed out the need for improved water quality monitoring and analysis useful at local, state, regional and national scales. Among these are studies by the General Accounting Office (GAO, 2000), the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA, 2002) and the H. John Heinz Center for Science, Economics and the Environment (Heinz, 2002). These reports lead up to and support the EPA 2003 Report on the Environment (USEPA, 2003) conclusion that there is not sufficient data to produce a statistically valid assessment of the condition of the nation's waters and watersheds. Section 305(b) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) directs states to report on the condition of the Nation's waters. One goal of this RFP is to explore options and develop an approach that would help states, either individually or collectively, meet the CWA objective to assess all waters.

EPA is working with federal and state partners to develop and promote the use of numerous monitoring tools to answer a variety of water quality management questions at multiple scales. These tools include probability based surveys, predictive models and remote sensing. The Coastal Condition Report (USEPA, 2001), National Lake Fish Tissue Study (USEPA, In Progress) and the Wadeable Streams Assessment (WSA) (USEPA, In Progress) are examples of one of these tools, the probability-based sampling design. An advantage of the probability-based design is that a relatively small set of sample sites can be used to make inferences about the condition of the entire target population of lakes, ponds, reservoirs. However, there may be other sampling designs that provide a cost effective means of generating statistically-valid inferences about the condition of all lake resources. The sampling design is just one piece of the assessment, other key components include resource classification to support lake stratification; indicator selection; sample collection and processing methods; and data interpretation methods which include defining reference condition, developing metrics, indices and/or models, and selecting thresholds or categories of condition. Innovative ideas for resource assessment are expected and encouraged in response to this RFP.

The NLAPP cooperative agreements provide eligible applicants an opportunity to carry out projects to contribute to the "best" overall design of a national lakes monitoring study. Award recipients may pursue a wide range of activities, such as developing or evaluating indicator tools, assessing field monitoring protocols, reviewing existing lake data and literature and conducting a national conference of lake experts. The statutory authority for NLAPP funding assistance is section 104(b) (3) of the CWA. Section 104(b)(3) of the CWA restricts the use of these funds to the following: conducting or promoting the coordination and acceleration of research, investigations, experiments, training, demonstrations, surveys, and studies relating to the causes, effects (including health and welfare effects), extent, prevention, reduction, and elimination of water pollution. All projects funded through this program must contribute to the overall development and design of a regional/national scale study of condition of lakes, reservoirs and ponds.

Proposals will be separated into one of two funding priority categories for scoring purposes: 1.) Background reports, a national conference and follow up workshops and

analysis. (Funding for a national conference will be limited to $100K), and 2.) Field/pilot projects on reference conditions, methods comparability, etc. We consider reference site condition investigation and sampling methods performance and comparability work to be of the **highest** priority for this funding priority category. A national assessment of lakes will likely be of probabilistic design and have a major bioassessment component. Please indicate which funding priority category you are applying for and if applying for both, submit a separate distinct proposal package for category 1 and for category 2.

The following describes the scope of fundable components under the two funding priority categories. Applicants may respond to any one or a combination of components.

1. Background, National Conference, Follow-up Workshops and Analysis and Volunteer Monitoring

a. NLA Background Report

Prepare a review or background paper on "The State of Lake Monitoring." The paper should inform the discussion on one or more of the following topics, such as, is there value in modeling a national lakes survey after an existing study, what is the status of lake bioassessment programs across the U.S., what is the performance of different sampling and lab methods, what approaches have been implemented for lakes classification and development of reference condition?
There are numerous studies and guidance documents published that should be considered in the development of a national lakes study. The results of these papers will provide input to the national conference and should be completed by January 2006.

b. National Conference, Workshops and Summary Reports

Conduct a conference or workshop that brings together leading lake assessment practitioners from academia and federal, state, interstate and tribal agencies to explore and develop a consensus approach to national lake assessment. In the work plan for the conference, applicants

should demonstrate a knowledge of lake and reservoir processes and condition; expertise in lake water quality monitoring and assessment; and familiarity with the current state of lake science in the U.S. The work plan should also include a draft agenda covering key topics. Proposals should demonstrate the applicant's experience and ability in organizing a successful national scientific conference, including program development, planning committee coordination, speaker recruitment and coordination, conference publicity, development of written materials, conference logistics, and follow-up conference evaluation.

This conference would be held winter or spring 2006 in order to support a national lakes assessment potentially beginning in 2006. Follow up workshops may be considered following analysis of pilot projects completed under this RFP or to support implementation of the national lakes project. Another activity may include a report on the overall findings of projects funded by cooperative agreements resulting from this RFP.

Only one assistance funding recipient will be chosen to produce the national conference with a funding limit of $100,000. This does not apply to the follow up workshops and summary report.

c. Volunteer Lake Monitoring

A number of states and lake association/consortiums use volunteers to collect monitoring data in lakes. Investigate to what extent their data can be used in a national lakes assessment, and degree of reliability of the data. Methods comparison studies should be performed or existing studies reviewed. An evaluation of how a volunteer lake monitoring effort would blend with other segments of a national lake monitoring and assessment effort should be explored.

2. Field Studies and Pilot Projects

a. Probabilistic Design

Investigate the use of a probabilistic survey design at the state or regional scale that will support state needs as well as the CWA goal to report on the condition of the Nation's waters. What adjustments would be necessary depending on size or regional classification of lakes? How would target waterbodies be defined (based on size, condition, location, etc)? Could this approach be made to benefit regional and state needs?

b. Key Indicators and Sampling/Lab Methods

Determine which indicators of lake quality (e.g., biological integrity, nutrients, trophic status, invasive species, water clarity, chlorophyll-a) are most informative for a national study and could realistically be collected, and explore best available field/lab methods. Note that tissue analysis is not an area covered under this RFP. Analytical, logistical, and methodological considerations should be addressed. Indicators should inform the goals of the CWA, i.e., to protect fish, shellfish and wildlife and allow recreational opportunities in and on the water.

c. Methods for Assessing Biological Integrity and/or Physical Habitat Indices

One of the most significant gaps in the science of lake assessment is the ability to assess biotic integrity as we do in streams and rivers. Investigation into biological assessment methods area would be based on the research done to develop TVA (TVA, 1994) and USEPA Region 1/ORD (USEPA, OEMI, In Progress) methods as well as methods described in the USEPA Lakes Biocriteria Guidance (USEPA, 1998). Physical habitat indices for lakes also need to be addressed. The work of Kaufmann, et.al., on habitat indices may be helpful (Kaufmann, 1999).

d. Reference Condition

At present, very little information exists on reference conditions for lakes. These conditions represent the "biotic potential for lakes in the absence of human activity or pollution" (USEPA 1998, 4-1). They characterize what the ecological condition and biological composition would be without anthropogenic disturbances. Development of this baseline and comparing how far a lake is from reference is critical for data analysis and evaluating current ecological conditions. Establishment of reference conditions is a key component for comparison of future monitoring programs. A lake classification system and site selection criteria, with each class containing a set of reference sites, could be a part of this component.

e. Remote Sensing

Investigate the use of remote sensing for gathering and interpreting data on lake indicators, (e.g., chlorophyll A). Demonstrate that Landsat (or other platforms) images may be used to help with lake classification, screening reference sites, standards assessment, targeting future monitoring, and other CWA programmatic needs.

f. Comparability of Biological and Habitat Methods

Research is needed on information gaps that impact data use and analysis, i.e., comparability of state sampling methods and investigating their applicability to a national lake survey. We are looking for multi-organizational (e.g., state, volunteer monitoring groups, regional consortia) collaboration on methods comparability which includes the methods of various organizations and methods recommended in national guidance (Refer to reference citations in item I A. 2.c.). Work in these areas would assist states and other partners in building their lake assessment capacity.

C. NLAPP Goals for 2005

The goals of the NLAPP include supporting collaboration among multiple levels of government and non-government lake experts in assessing the Nation's lake/reservoir/pond resources and building the capacity to employ comparable monitoring and assessment techniques. The NLAPP endeavors to enhance state capacity to implement a monitoring framework that applies multiple tools to address a variety of lake management decision needs at appropriate scales. The knowledge gained from projects funded for planning such an assessment should improve the science of monitoring and managing lakes, reservoirs and ponds in numerous ways.

II. Award Information

A. Eligible Activities

CWA section 104(b)(3) authorizes the Agency to award funds to conduct projects that promote the coordination and acceleration of research, investigations, experiments, training, demonstrations, surveys, and studies relating to the causes, effects (including health and welfare effects), extent, prevention, reduction, and elimination of water pollution. Assistance funds awarded as part of the NLAPP cooperative agreements may only be used for these activities and all grant-funded activities must support the workplan submitted.

These activities seek to advance the state of knowledge, gather information, or transfer information. Demonstrations are projects that exhibit new or experimental technologies, methods, or approaches and disseminate the results so that others can benefit from the knowledge gained. Research projects may include the application of established practices when they contribute to learning about an environmental concept or problem.

B. Funding Availability

EPA expects approximately $1,000,000 available in FY 2005. EPA anticipates that typical cooperative agreement awards for the selected projects will range from $100,000 to $300,000 depending on the amount requested and the overall size and need

of the project. Funding for the national conference is limited to $100,000. EPA reserves the right to not make any awards.

C. Grants and Cooperative Agreements

EPA intends to award the NLAPP assistance as cooperative agreements. EPA will have substantial involvement as a full partner in decision making, project design and guidance and quality assurance in all phases of the project. EPA will require quarterly reports and make site visits as resources allow.

D. Multi-Year Project Periods

EPA normally funds cooperative agreements and grants on a 12-month basis. However, EPA can negotiate the project period with each applicant based on project requirements. The project period for NLAPP should be no more than two years; however, all funds will be awarded at the start of the project in FY 05. EPA hopes that all monitoring will be completed in the summer of 2005, but does not exclude the possibility of fieldwork being conducted in 2006. EPA further hopes that the pilot projects will generate results that will be considered at a meeting of lake assessment practitioners in early 2006 and will shape the recommendations for a study that will assess the condition of lakes at multiple scales and produce results that are statistically-valid at a national scale.

III. Eligibility Information

A. Eligible Applicants

States, territories, Indian Tribes, interstate agencies, and possessions of the U.S., including the District of Columbia, public and private universities and colleges, hospitals, laboratories, other public and private nonprofit-institutions and individuals are eligible to apply.

B. Cost Sharing or Matching

No cost share or match is required. However, projects with matching funding, in-kind services or other support, will be favored; 10% of the ranking factor will be based on partnerships and matching support (see Section V.A of this RFP). Matching funds are considered grant funds and are included in the total award amount and must be used for the reasonable and necessary expenses of carrying out the work plan. Any restrictions on the use of grant funds (examples of restrictions are outlined in Section IV.E of this RFP) also apply to the use of matching funds.

C. Other- Threshold Criteria

Applicants must submit eligible activities under section 104(b)(3) authority (see Section II.B of this RFP), must conform to the proposal submission requirements as described in Section IV.B and must address as many components as appropreiate described in Section V.A. Proposals that do not meet these threshold criteria will not be considered for funding.

IV. Application and Submission Information

A. Address to Submit Proposals

For response to this RFP, use of agency grant application forms is not necessary; the format of the proposal is given in Section IV of this RFP. Following evaluation of the proposals, full applications will be requested from the highest scoring applicants. It is preferred that proposals be electronically submitted to Otto Gutenson, email – gutenson.otto@epa.gov, in Word or Wordperfect. Hard copy submissions may be sent by overnight delivery or courier service to: Otto Gutenson, Room 7318A, EPA West, 1301 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20004. Phone 202-566-1183.

B. Content and Form of Application Submission

Applicants must submit a proposal of no more than ten pages. The ten pages must include a cover sheet (one page), abstract (one page), and work plan (limited to eight pages) as described below. Electronic submissions are preferred; however, proposals

sent by courier or Fed Ex/UPS are also acceptable. The electronic submissions may only be in Word, WordPerfect, or Adobe Acrobat format.

1. Cover Sheet (One page). The cover sheet must include all of the following information:

Name of applicant organization:

Response to Announcement Number EPA-OW-OWOW- NLAPP 2005-2

Date of submission:

Name of applicant contact person:

Mailing Address:

Telephone number:

Email:

Amount Requested: $

Response to Funding Priority Category (i.e., Category 1 or 2). Separate proposals are required if applying for both categories.

2. Abstract (one page). A summary of key objectives and final products.

3. Workplan Description (up to 8 pages). The narrative description of the workplan is limited to a total of eight pages, and items a-e must be addressed in those eight pages. The workplan must include a description of project tasks in direct response to the components listed in sections V.A. In addition, the workplan must also include the applicant's anticipated outputs and outcomes as well as a description of how results will be tracked. In the workplan for the national conference, applicants should include a draft agenda covering key topics.

4. Time-line. A proposal requesting funding for one year should include a timeframe no longer than 12 months. If the proposal is for a multi-year agreement, the timeline for the entire period of application, broken into 12-month increments, must be included (with all monitoring to be completed no later than summer 2006.)

5. Budget and estimated funding amounts. The following Table with budget breakdown information must be completed, including any matching funds, for each year that funding is requested.

Object Class Categories	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
a. Personnel	$	$	$
b. Fringe Benefits	$	$	$
c. Travel	$	$	$
d. Equipment	$	$	$
e. Supplies	$	$	$
f. Contractual	$	$	$
g. Construction	$	$	$
h. Other	$	$	$
i. Total Direct Charges (sum of a-h)	$	$	$
j. Indirect Charges	$	$	$
k. TOTALS (sum of i and j)	$	$	$

6. Reporting schedule. EPA requires quarterly reports by all grantees. Please identify here how those reports will be submitted to EPA.

7. Description of applicant credentials. Applicants should describe their programmatic and technical capabilities and experience in conducting the activities proposed. In the workplan for the national conference, applicants should demonstrate a knowledge of lake and reservoir processes and condition; expertise in lake water quality monitoring and assessment; and familiarity with the current state of lake science in the U.S.

8. Contact information. Contact information for the Grant Project Lead Manager, and Account Manager (funding coordinator).

C. Submission Dates and Times

The deadline for EPA receipt of proposals is 11:59 p.m. Eastern Standard Time on April 17, 2005. Proposals received after this deadline will not be considered. The applicant will receive a notice of receipt. In the event of difficulty, please see Section VII of this RFP for contact information.

D. Intergovernmental Review

The funds associated with this announcement require Executive Order (E.O.) 12372 (http://www.cfda.gov/public/eo12372.htm/) "Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs" compliance. E.O. 12372 structures the federal government's system of consultation with states and local governments on grant decisions, other forms of financial assistance, and direct development. Under E.O. 12372, states, in consultation with their local governments, design their own review process and select the federal financial assistance and direct development activities they wish to review. If selected for funding, the recipient of the federal assistance agreement will be required to send a copy of their application and proposal to the appropriate State Clearinghouse Office for an intergovernmental review, if applicable (http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants/spoc.html).

E. Funding Restrictions

Based on experience gained from previous years and policy and regulation, we offer the following comments/restrictions on funding eligibility.

- This grant program cannot fund land acquisition or purchase of easements.
- While contractual efforts can be a part of these assistance agreements, each recipient must be significantly involved in the administration of the grant. EPA recommends that recipients use no more than 50% of the grant funds to contract with non-governmental entities. However, if the applicant wants to exceed this limit, the applicant must submit a written justification for greater involvement by non-governmental contractors. EPA will evaluate the need for greater contractual participation and may approve the request if they agree that there is adequate justification to exceed the 50% limit. For the purposes of this requirement, EPA will not consider work performed under a contract with other state, tribal, or local government agencies, interstate associations, and intertribal consortia as part of the 50% rule. If another state, tribal, local government, or interstate agency is doing the contractual work, this must be clearly indicated in the grant application.
- Grant funds cannot be used to fund an honorarium under this program.

- Recipients should not anticipate additional funding beyond the initial award of funds for a specific project. Eligible applicants should request the entire amount of money needed to complete the project in the original grant application. Each grant should produce a final, discrete product. Funding and project periods can be for more than one year but monitoring must be completed no later than summer of 2006.

F. Other Submission Requirements

Applicants that are requested by EPA to submit full applications will be required to provide a Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) Data Universal Number System (DUNS) number when applying for a Federal grant or cooperative agreement. Applicants can receive a DUNS number, at no cost, by calling the dedicated toll-free DUNS Number request line at 1-866-705-5711, or visiting the D&B website at: http://www.dnb.com.

G. Proprietary Information

In accordance with 40 CFR 2.203, Applicants may claim all or a portion of their application/proposal as confidential business information. EPA will evaluate confidentiality claims in accordance with 40 CFR Part 2. Applicants must clearly mark applications/proposals or portions of applications/proposals they claim as confidential. If no claim of confidentiality is made, EPA is not required to make the inquiry to the applicant otherwise required by 40 CFR 2.204(c)(2) prior to disclosure.

V. Application Review Information

A. Criteria

Each of the proposals will be ranked according to the following criteria based on the funding priority category applied for (followed by relative review weight). There are two groups of criteria, one for a national conference and related topics and another for pilot and field projects and related topics, for scoring proposals appropriately.

Background Reports, National Conference, Follow-up Workshops and Volunteer Monitoring RFP Criteria. (165 total points)

- The proposal adheres to the scope of this RFP, responds directly to the program priorities and is clearly written. (10 points)
- The applicant has expertise in lake assessment and criteria development. (15 points)
- The applicant has past experience in planning and conducting conferences/workshops. (30 points)
- The applicant has past experience in conducting conferences/workshops to build partnerships among lake assessment and management practitioners on designing lake studies and indicator systems. (10 points)
- The proposal promotes collaborative partnerships and/or leverages additional expertise or resources. (10 points)
- The proposal includes participation by a range of organizations with interest and expertise in lake assessment and management (e.g., academia, state and local governments, lake associations and volunteer monitoring programs) with an inter-state, regional or national perspective. (25 points)
- The applicant has past experience working with lake monitoring volunteers and blending their efforts with state, regional or national resource assessment projects. (25 points)
- The proposal includes a paper on "The State of Lake Monitoring," which would include review of important lake studies, monitoring design and methods and other issues to inform a national lake assessment plan. (20 points)
- The proposal must describe how environmental benefit will result from the proposed work and describe the evaluation component to assess or measure the environmental outcomes. This applies to projects that improve program integrity or efficiency as well as those with direct environmental benefits. (20 points)

Field Studies and Pilot Projects RFP Criteria. (180 total points)

- The proposal adheres to the scope of this RFP and responds directly to one or more of the following priority information needs for developing a national lakes study:

    - Contributes to classification of lakes for purposes of developing sample frame and/or supporting development of reference condition. (10 points)
    - Contributes to identification of reference sites and reference condition serving state, regional and national scale assessment. (20 points)
    - Contributes to documentation of sampling methods performance and comparability to support aggregation of results from multiple methods. (20 points)
    - Contributes to selection of cost-effective indicators or parameters of physical, chemical and biological integrity of lakes relative to supporting aquatic life and recreational activities. (10 points)
    - Contributes to data interpretation, for example developing metrics, indices and/or models, and selecting thresholds or categories of condition. (10 points)

- Quality and feasibility of work plan. (25 points)

- The proposal promotes collaborative partnerships and/or leverages additional expertise or resources. (10 points)

- The proposal demonstrates the applicant's expertise in lake assessment, criteria development, and data analysis and storage. (15 points)

- The proposal includes participation by a range of organizations with interest and expertise in lake assessment and management (e.g., academia, state and local governments, lake associations and volunteer monitoring programs) with an inter-state, regional or national perspective. (20 points)

- Timelines of project completion; with higher scores going to proposals that expect to contribute project results to support development of a national study in 2006. (20 points)

- The proposal must describe how environmental benefit will result from the proposed work and describe the evaluation component to assess or measure the environmental outcomes. This applies to projects that improve program integrity or efficiency as well as those with direct environmental benefits. (20 points)

B. Review and Selection Process

EPA Headquarters staff will review each proposal to ensure that the threshold eligibility criteria in Section III.C. have been met. A team of two or more EPA staff, including regional and ORD staff where appropriate, will then evaluate and rank the eligible proposals based on the evaluation criteria described in Section V.A. The EPA team will make the final selection of proposals for which the applicant will be invited to submit full funding assistance applications based, in part, on the highest number of points scored. In addition to the selection criteria above, other factors such as geographic diversity, programmatic priorities, project diversity and program diversity may be considered in selecting proposals for award.

VI. Award Administration and Information

A. Award Notices

All applicants will be notified by the EPA Headquarters on whether or not the proposal has been selected for funding. The notification is not an authorization to begin

performance. A notice signed by the Grants Administration Division is the authorizing document to the applicant to begin performance. EPA reserves the right to reject all proposals and make no awards as a result of this RFP.

If selected for funding, EPA will request a full proposal from the applicant. For final proposals, the standard application forms will be furnished by the EPA. These are required for proposals by OMB Circular No. A-102 and A-110. EPA requires final proposals to be made on Standard Form 424. Requests for full proposal kits can be submitted to the Environmental Protection Agency, Grants Administration Division, 3903R, Washington, DC 20460. Additional information on full proposals can be found at: http://www.epa.gov/ogd/grants/how_to_apply.htm/.

B. Administrative and National Policy Requirements

The general award and administration process for NLAPP assistance agreements are governed by regulations at 40 CFR part 30 (Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations) and 40 CFR part 31 (States, Tribes, interstate agencies, intertribal consortia and local governments).

Certain quality assurance and/or quality control (QA/QC) and peer review requirements are applicable to the collection of environmental data. Applicants should allow sufficient time and resources for this process in their proposed projects. Environmental data are any measurements or information that describe environmental processes, location, or condition; ecological or health effects and consequences; or the performance of environmental technology. Environmental data also include information collected directly from measurements, produced from models, and obtained from other sources such as data bases or published literature.

Recipients will be required to institute standardized reporting requirements into their workplan and include such costs in their budgets. All environmental data will be required to be entered into the Agency's Storage and Retrieval (STORET) data system. STORET is a repository for water quality, biological, and other physical data used by State environmental agencies, EPA and other federal agencies, universities, private citizens, and many other organizations. EPA will provide STORET software and Oracle, as needed, at no cost. Watershed organizations may also want to contact their State

agency responsible for entering data into the system. More information about STORET can be found at http://www.epa.gov/STORET.

Regulations pertaining to QA/QC requirements can be found in 40 CFR Parts 30.54 and 31.45. Additional guidance can be found at http://www.epa.gov/quality/qa_docs.html#noeparqt.

C. Reporting

Project monitoring and reporting requirements can be found in 40 CFR 30.50-30.54, 40 CFR 31.40-31.45 and 40 CFR 40.160. In general, recipients are responsible for managing the day-to-day operations and activities supported by the assistance funding, to assure compliance with applicable Federal requirements, and for ensuring that established milestones and performance goals are being achieved. Performance reports and financial reports must be submitted quarterly and are due 30 days after the reporting period. The final report is due 90 days after the assistance agreement has expired. Recipients will be required to report direct and indirect environmental results that result from the work accomplished through the award.

D. Dispute Procedures

Assistance agreement competition-related disputes will be resolved in accordance with the dispute resolution procedures published in 70 FR (Federal Register) 3629, 3630 (January 26, 2005) which can be found at http://a257.g.akamaitech.net/7/257/2422/01jan20051800/edocket.access.gpo.gov/2005/05-1371.htm. Copies of these procedures may also be requested by contacting Otto Gutenson at gutenson.otto@epa.gov or 202-566-1183.

VII. Agency Contacts

For further information regarding this RFP, email gutenson.otto@epa.gov or call at 202-566-1183. The RFP will be posted at http://www.epa.gov/owow/funding.html.

References Cited:

General Accounting Office. March 2000. *Water Quality-Key EPA and State Decisions Limited by Inconsistent and Incomplete Data.* GAO/RCED-00-54.

H. John Heinz Center for Science, Economics, and the Environment. 2002. *The State of the Nation's Ecosystems: Measuring the Lands, Waters and Living Resources of the United States.* Cambridge University Press, New York, NY.

Kaufmann, P.R., Levine, P., Robison, E.G., Seeliger, C., and Peck, D. (1999). "Quantifying Physical Habitat in Wadeable Streams." EPA/620/R-99/003, U.W. EPA, Washington, DC.

National Academy of Public Administration. December 2002. *Understanding What States Need to Protect Water Quality.* Academy Project Number 2001-001.

TVA. 1994. Tennessee Valley reservoir and stream quality- 1993: Summary of vital signs and use suitability monitoring. Vol.I. *Water Management*. Tennessee Valley Authority, Water Resources Division, Chattanooga, TN.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. September 2001. National Coastal Condition Report I. EPA-620/R-01/005.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. August 1998. Lake and Reservoir Bioassessment and Biocriteria: Technical Guidance Document. EPA 841-B-98-007.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2003. Report on the Environment. EPA 600-R-03-050.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. In Progress. *Wadeable Streams Assessment* . U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. In Progress. *New England Lakes Survey.* Office of Environmental Management and Information. EPA Region 1, North Chelmsford, MA.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. In Progress. *National Lake Fish Tissue Study*, Office of Water, www.epa.gov/waterscience/fishstudy/overview.htm